HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 48 Wednesday, December 2, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

ROCKEFELLER: *GOP's problem child* .... (page 1)
BUDGET: *Military misspending* ..... (page 2)
FOREIGN AID: *Film follies* ..... (page 3)
LOYALTY: *Why the oath is needed* ..... (page 3)
EDUCATION: *More money for this?* ..... (page 4)

Rockefeller is a Problem: Republicans are becoming worried about the image which the New York Governor is presenting to more and more voters. It is an image of Big Money—a whole complex of family-controlled interests—seeking to corral a majority of Republican convention delegates preparatory to the general election.

Whether this proves to be a true picture or not, it would (in case Nelson wins the nomination) provide the Democrats with a powerful issue for the general election. In our time, it has been often remarked, "a candidate—with his own money—can't buy a Presidential election, but one man can buy a Presidential nomination." Democratic strategists undoubtedly have this in mind; and their double talk to the effect that Rocky, not Nixon, is the man Democrats fear, sounds very much like a maneuver to sell unwary Republicans on the New York Governor as nominee. If that happens, observers believe, then the Democratic strategists would have an inflammable issue for November, 1960.

However that may be, Republicans are indubitably becoming worried about what the Rockefeller "money power" might do at the GOP convention (see the alarms sounded in the conservative *Los Angeles Times* against Rockefeller and the Chase Bank). Old GOP pros have not forgotten some of the charges levelled at "Wall Street power" working on delegates in the 1952 convention against Taft and for Eisenhower.

It is now recalled that, just as the GOP 1952 convention opened in Chicago, the Chicago Tribune *(July 7, 1952) ran a sensational story, charging that—for two months previously—the Eisenhower forces had been preparing a "telegram blitz" similar to but more intensive than that staged by Wall Street in 1940 to nominate Wendell Willkie.*

"The project," said the *Tribune*, "was created by members of the machine of Governor Dewey, reported working under the direction of Winthrop Aldrich, Wall Street banker . . . . Under pressure of Aldrich and his Chase National Bank, it was said, lists of American stockholders were supplied to the group." The group, said the *Tribune*, got share trading information generally regarded as secret and inaccessible. The stock lists were arranged on a congressional district basis.

From offices in a New York hotel, this group—said the *Tribune*—telegraphed names of big stockholders to corresponding banks in those districts and "banks which had made loans to the big holders put pressure on these businessmen." The latter then put pressure on convention delegates to join the Ike banner against Taft. Signs of this "blitz" leaked out; the *Tribune* reported that on "some telegrams, senders have failed to remove instructions that the same wire be sent to other convention personages."

So ran the *Chicago Tribune* story, based on some very alert reporting and authoritative sources. When the story was shown to Winthrop Aldrich at his Chicago hotel on July 7, 1952, the latter denounced it as "Lies, all lies, unmitigated, unqualified lies." However, other reporters on the scene—including those of HUMAN EVENTS—were convinced that something very similar to this blitz was under way. GOP pros left the Chicago convention, following Ike's nomination victory, with a strong fear of Wall Street "money power." And after the GOP Administration had taken over from Truman, it was noted that Winthrop Aldrich was given the No. 1 diplomatic patronage prize—the post of US Ambassador to Great Britain.

Today, the GOP pros have this 1952 episode very much in mind. Republican professional experience with the New Dealers who run the Democratic party, in league with the "class-warfare" ranting Walter Reuther, gives these GOP pros scant assurance that the Donkey would fail to wage a rip-snorting, anti-Wall Street campaign, in case Nelson took the GOP nomination. It is believed on Capitol Hill that this foreboding has been a factor in the overwhelming preference shown by GOP professionals for the banner of Vice President Nixon.

(See Article Section III of this issue for a long unpublished document from the hand of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, "How I Lost the Nomination.")

Capitol Camera: GOP pros in the Capital note that the Nixon organization is getting under way in the District of Columbia and other places, through newly-created local units. In the District of Columbia, former Ambassador Clifford Folger is treasurer of the active Nixon organization. Folger was Chairman of the Republican National Finance Committee from 1955 to 1957. Presumably, Folger will become treasurer of a Nixon national campaign when it becomes such.

Much progress is also reported from the Nixon organization in New Hampshire, which is preparing for the crucial March 8 primary in that state. Veterans, farmers, labor and college task forces are said to be forging ahead in smoothing the road for the Vice President.

Also, it is noticed that former Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks has joined the Nixon forces, as well as William Robinson, Chairman of the Coca-Cola Company.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Both Weeks and Robinson, it is recalled, were outstanding pre-convention Eisenhower supporters in 1952.

● Diplomatic Row reports that Secretary of State Herter will name Ambassador Bohlen to be Deputy Undersecretary of State (Livingston Merchant is Undersecretary). At present, Bohlen is merely "Adviser" on Russian matters for Herter. It is believed that Bohlen as Deputy Undersecretary will guide all foreign policy via Merchant who is regarded as just an ordinary State Department bureaucrat. What will happen in the Senate when and if Herter sends up Bohlen's name for approval is a matter of much discussion. Prominent GOP leaders have long and bitterly opposed Bohlen.

● Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Arthur Flemming is fast becoming the favorite whipping boy (rivalling Secretary of Agriculture Benson) of rural state members of Congress as a result of Flemming's action in the "cranberry crisis." It is believed that Flemming acted without sufficient study of the troublesome situation. The HEW chief is an old friend of Brother Milton Eisenhower and reportedly owes his appointment to the latter. Today, many GOP members of Congress from farm states say Flemming must resign if Republicans are to have a chance to win the farm vote in 1960.

● British fears of General de Gaulle's growing prestige have led to a counter-publicity campaign to undermine de Gaulle in American eyes. One tack—that France under the General is not financially sound—has run into heavy water. For the French Government recently made its indebtedness payments to the International Monetary Fund for two years in advance in the amount of $200 million in gold and dollars.

● Many in the Capital were pleased with the appointment of C. Norman Brunsdale to succeed the late Senator William Langer (R.-N.D.). Brunsdale served three terms as governor of North Dakota (1950-56) and was a strong Taft supporter in 1952. He is expected to vote as a conservative Republican in the Senate next year, providing a marked contrast with his maverick predecessor, particularly on domestic issues, where every conservative vote will be needed to hold the line against "liberal" spending-for-votes.

Double Standard: The un-union-like reaction of Steelworkers' boss David McDonald was generally overlooked when three companies recently defected from the steel firms' otherwise united stand against the inflationary wage demands of the Steelworkers. Drawing attention to this oversight, Spiritual Mobilization's Edward W. Greenfield writes:

"Whatever the rest of the hundred steel companies may think of the departure from the solid front they tried to hold against the solid front of the union, McDonald made it clear that he thought such independent action was 'real, enlightened leadership!' "

Greenfield asks, "What happens if an individual worker tries to make a separate and independent agreement? . . . Here again is the 'double standard' by which present-day unionism maintains its strangling power. Independence, freedom of contract, the right to make one's own bargain? Enlightened leadership! says McDonald—unless you happen to be a working man under a union's thumb! Then you're a 'scab!' "

Taxes: It's the man in the middle who pays the highest percentage of taxes on his income, according to evidence offered before the House Ways and Means Committee last week by Richard A. Musgrave, political economist at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Musgrave reported that "loopholes" in the present tax laws—preferences, exclusions, deductions—permit taxpayers in both the lower and higher income brackets to pay much less than the specified tax rates.

The economist supplied the following examples to show that the man in the middle income bracket bears the heaviest burden of taxation.

● *Taxpayers in the $600 to $2400 annual income bracket now pay only 24 per cent of the taxes they would pay if the "loopholes" were abolished.*

● Taxpayers earning $1 million a year pay only 26 per cent of the amount they would pay if the "loopholes" were closed.

● In contrast, persons earning between $5000 and $10,000 a year are now paying 66 per cent of what they would pay without the "loopholes."

Federal Aid: It's a small case, but a significant one—providing another bit of evidence as to what "Federal aid" really means: Oregon highways have long been marked by yellow dividing lines instead of white, because motorists prefer the former. Now, without any consideration of motorists' wishes, the state Highway Department has announced white lines will replace the yellow—because the Federal Government has decreed that unless white lines are used, a state cannot receive any funds from the interstate highway program. As the Portland *Oregonian* noted: "When Uncle Sam puts up the money for a new suit, he not only decides what kind of suit it shall be but also picks the color of the tie."

Military Budget: Groans from the Pentagon follow reports that Maurice Stans, Director of the Budget, has been doing some surgery on the Budget requests submitted by the three armed services. Capitol Hill—while not going into the merits of the planned cuts—remains in a sceptical mood. Congressional people wonder whether the Pentagon is going to eliminate some outstanding types of waste or not—such as:

(1) A House committee claims that the Defense Department spent $200 million on two chemical fuel-plants and then abandoned them without turning out any fuel.

(2) The General Accounting Office asserts that the Military Sea Transportation Service wasted a couple of hundred thousand dollars by inefficient use of shipping space.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) The GAO also alleges that the Navy frittered away $2 million on extravagant bookkeeping systems; that the Army had overpaid soldiers and dependents to the tune of $24 million in two years; that the Air Force wasted $60 million in unneeded spare parts for planes. Etc., etc.

These are matters which give Capitol Hill a perspective in judging the conflicting arguments of the military budgeteers. And Congress cannot forget that Hoover Commission people remain very unsatisfied with the failure of the Pentagon to put through the recommendations made by former President Hoover to eliminate waste in defense.

Clergy: Commanding considerable attention in the Nation's Capital last week was a joint statement entitled "Peace and Freedom," issued by the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States at the conclusion of their annual meeting in Washington. In crystal-clear language, the statement appraised the Communist "peace" offensive, commented on tools being used by the free world to combat communism and pointed the way to lasting peace.

Here are some of the more striking observations contained in the statement:

On Peace and Friendship—"By 'peace' the Communist means submission to his program. By 'friendship' he means the acceptance on the part of others of his formula for coexistence."

Peace and International Law—"Not even international organizations and international law, essential as they are for order in the world, can bring about world peace. Fundamentally, that peace depends on the acceptance by men and nations of a fixed, unchangeable, universal moral law."

Negotiations—" . . . statesmen of the world . . . must be firm in upholding principle and justice, knowing that appeasement in such matters leads only to the peace of the conquered. It is a delusion to place hope in seeking real understanding when the true problem is a conflict of essential principles, not lack of understanding."

Aiding Other Nations—" . . . the needs of the world will not be met by charitable aid alone. The greater charity is to help people to help themselves . . . . "

On Materialism—". . . We have aimed our efforts at satisfying the body, and, paradoxically, have allowed the Communists to capture the minds of men."

America's role—" . . . Mankind will follow only those who give it a higher cause and the leadership of their dedication. It is up to us to give that leadership to mankind in the cause of God's freedom and peace."

Dollars for Trouble: Another foreign aid project is about to boomerang on the US, this one in Communist-infested Indonesia. It began last summer when the International Cooperation Administration—at the direction of the State Department—spent hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars to hire Hollywood technicians, sent them to Indonesia to build studios and teach the natives the art of making "educational" motion pictures.

How successful was the project? Earlier this month the Indonesian Government ordered its new film industry to produce 50 features that would "counteract the influence of crazy Western culture" movies. (A few months ago, Communist-lining Dictator Achmed Sukarno bowed to demands from Red China and banned Indonesia's showing of "Inn of the Sixth Happiness," a 20th Century Fox production based on the work of missionaries on the Chinese mainland before it was overrun by the Communists.)

Indonesia plans ultimately to make at least 150 motion pictures a year, and boasts that each new local production will mean one less import from the US.

Commenting on this new overseas "investment," the Hollywood Reporter *magazine says: "Perhaps . . . inquiry should be made of Congress as to whether, in voting funds to ICA, American lawmakers were aware some of the money was going to be used to establish in a left-wing, Kremlin-cozing country a film industry where none existed before. Films, it must be remembered, are propaganda weapons."*

A Happy Poland? Americans—especially grass-roots Governors—who recently toured Poland told of the relaxed atmosphere prevalent in the land, with shops full and people cheery. Apparently it sometimes takes a good old-fashioned political defection to show the easily charmed—both in and out of government—that they have been suckers for Red window dressing during their Commie Cook's tour of Soviet occupied nations.

The State Department announcement last week that a top Polish intelligence man has received American asylum in Vienna brought out unpublicized recent defections by Polish officials in Tokyo and Paris.

Reported the *New York Times*: "The defection of Colonel Monat, who was in charge of coordinating the work of Polish military attaches all over the world, came this summer at a time when a crisis was brewing in Poland" (and when Americans were reporting how jolly things were -Ed.) "and has had political ramifications.

"The crisis itself was a result of economic and political problems. But the Monat defection added to the state of nervous tension that has gripped Wladyslaw Gomulka, Poland's Communist chief, and other Polish Communist leaders."

Loyalty Oath: Once again the "liberal" press is blasting the loyalty oath and anti-Communist affidavit that must be signed by college students who receive Government loans under the National Defense Education Act. And this requirement has become so noxious to 11 of 1370 participating universities (which put up $1 for every $9 appropriated by the Federal Government) that they have bowed out of the program because it "singles out students as a class."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, counter arguments are being put forth in many other quarters:

(1) The Act which loans funds to students is a Defense act, and the Federal Government has a right to set up loyalty requirements for people who participate in the *defense* of the United States Government.

(2) Students have been taking loyalty oaths for several years without feeling the terrible indignity of it all. Says Senator Dirksen of Illinois: "What about the boys at West Point? They held up their hands. They do not seem to mind doing it . . . ."

(3) South Carolina's Senator Johnston, a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, says it is needed to protect the student because the Communists "who use the students within the college to further their purpose" will shy away from the known loyal student.

(4) Those who say it is unnecessary because Communists lie anyhow, noted columnist David Lawrence last week, forget that Alger Hiss was jailed, not because he was a Communist, but because he lied under oath to a congressional committee.

Education: "Liberal" educators keep demanding more "Beat the Russians" money for our schools, but they have a strange way of making use of funds already on hand, as evidenced in the November *Bulletin* published by the Council for Basic Education (725 15th St., N.W., Washington, D.C.):

● The Fresno County Schools are conducting a Sunrise Seminar TV Series, described by the county superintendent as "a unique way in which school employees can join hands for mutual professional growth." The programs for October: Fundamentals of Touch Football, Fundamentals of Volleyball, How Big Is Space (how did that get in there?) and Fundamentals of Boys' Basketball.

● An AP dispatch states that San Francisco State College is about to offer a course called "Put Your Right Foot Forward." Five faculty members will instruct students in etiquette, proper dress, and how to write a letter.

● *The sixth annual clinic for high school cheerleaders, which aims to "show the youngsters the art of crowd control, with a positive approach to cheering," has just been held at the University of Alabama.*

● The Barnstable, Massachusetts, high school has just inaugurated a 10-weeks course in baby sitting.

● More than 3,000 home economics teachers have accepted a Chicago manufacturer's offer of a free classroom kit, which includes a color film explaining "the five basic bra types, construction and quality features of bras and girdles," and "a record, teacher's guide, a companion student booklet, wall chart and a demonstration bra."

Inflation: A high-ranking Department of Commerce official has called on businessmen to wage a sound dollar crusade to help combat "new inflationary demands for big spending programs" that can be expected in Congress during the Presidential election year of 1960. Undersecretary of Commerce Philip A. Ray also told a Baltimore audience last week that President Eisenhower's battle against inflation is basically a moral struggle.

"Demands for excessive spending by Government, the price-cost squeeze and other inflationary pressures," said the Undersecretary, "come down to a moral issue—too many want too much for producing too little."

"From time immemorial," added Ray, "we have jailed the thieves who break in and steal, yet inflation, the greatest thief, not only robs the money and savings of all of us, it also robs our work of its value in the market place."

"Liberal" Love Feast: Rich pinks had best buy a ticket and a few extra hankies for next week's $100 a plate Democratic dinner at New York's Waldorf Astoria. It shapes up as the biggest "liberal" jam session in many a season.

The occasion: A testimonial to Eleanor Roosevelt and a homecoming party for Henry Wallace, head of the Commie-backed 1948 Progressive ticket. Such limelight people as Tallulah Bankhead and Cyrus Eaton are among the sponsors and Adlai Stevenson, although suffering from William Jennings Bryan disease, will attend. Proceeds will go to the summit ADA—the Democratic Advisory Committee.

The date is a dandy—December 7, the 18th anniversary of Pearl Harbor—and many wonder if the planners had F.D.R. in mind when picking it.

In any case, there is regret that Charlie Chaplin will be in Switzerland and Paul Robeson in London when this one comes off, but left-out "liberals" needn't fret—the New York *Post* will undoubtedly cover.

REV. FRANK C. ZAGUNIS, Bethel Baptist Church, Hartford, Conn.: "It not only keeps me posted but has much material to form good illustrations for messages."

REV. H. KEARNEY JONES, St. James' Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md.: "HUMAN EVENTS continues to be a 'must' in my reading and has been more than helpful in my work."

REV. THEODORE OFFERMAN, Trinity Lutheran Church, Coon Rapids, Iowa: "HUMAN EVENTS brings information to my desk I can get from no other source."

REV. A. M. SEREX, Rayne Memorial Methodist Church, New Orleans, La.: "I never fail to read every number of HUMAN EVENTS. You are rendering a great service to us."

VERY REV. CHARLES A. WILSON, Dean, St. Peter's Pro-Cathedral, Helena, Mont.: "I find HUMAN EVENTS most edifying and have made use of several articles in talks."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 48 HUMAN EVENTS December 2, 1959

Article Section I

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

RATING YOUR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

By Their Voting Records on Critical Issues

By JAMES L. WICK
Executive Publisher of HUMAN EVENTS

ADA (AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION) believes in Big Government, Big Labor, Big Spending and Big Taxing. It professes sympathy for small business, but its program would kill off small business. It is anti-anti-Communist. It urges expanding foreign aid, and it woud have the US give up much of its sovereignty to supranational organizations.

Once a year, ADA publishes a box score of the votes on selected issues of all members of Congress. Knowing ADA principles, anyone who wants to audit the voting record of his own Congressman can simply check the ADA box score reproduced herewith; if he believes in free enterprise, limited constitutional government and individual freedom, he can simply *reverse* the ADA ratings.

After studying these facts, you should write to your Senators and your Representatives, giving them your favorable or unfavorable opinion of their attitude. Left-wingers are energetic in writing to and talking to their Congressmen. Why shouldn't YOU be equally active in bringing your influence to bear upon your Representatives in the Nation's Capital?

The activity of left-wingers is graphically demonstrated by comparing the ratings for 1959 with those for 1958 (published in HUMAN EVENTS for October 20, 1958). The number of down-the-line "liberals" in the House of Representatives (those who supported ADA parrot-like 100 per cent of the time) more than doubled as a result of ADA and labor activity in the 1958 elections, portending grave trouble for conservatives in future elections, unless they mobilize now.

The first two pages of this Article Section are devoted to an analysis of House and Senate voting records, according to conservative and "liberal" groupings. The remaining six pages are devoted to a reproduction of the key roll call votes of all Senators and Representatives.

The Senate

70 to 100 per cent anti-ADA

The 98 members of the Senate are rated by ADA on their votes on 13 measures. Twenty-three Republicans and 14 Democrats voted 70 to 100 per cent *against* ADA. You may wish to consider them as your "Roll of Honor" Senators.

The 23 Republicans: Goldwater, Ariz.; Allott, Colo.; Bush, Conn.; Williams, Del.; Dworshak, Idaho; Dirksen, Ill.; Capehart, Ind.; Hickenlooper, Iowa; Martin, Iowa; Carlson, Kans.; Schoeppel, Kans.; Morton, Ky.; Butler, Md.; Saltonstall, Mass.; Curtis, Nebr.; Hruska, Nebr.; Bridges, N.H.; Cotton, N.H.; Young, N.D.; Case, S.D.; Mundt, S.D.; Bennett, Utah; Wiley, Wisc.

The 14 Democrats: McClellan, Ark.; Frear, Del.; Holland, Fla.; Smathers, Fla.; Russell, Ga.; Talmadge, Ga.; Ellender, La.; Eastland, Miss.; Stennis, Miss.; Ervin, N.C.; Jordan, N.C.; Thurmond, S.C.; Byrd, Va.; Robertson, Va.

55 to 70 per cent anti-ADA

Seven Republicans and three Democrats voted 55 to 70 per cent against ADA. You might choose to rate them as "satisfactory" Senators.

The seven Republicans: Kuchel, Calif.; Cooper, Ky.; Smith, Me.; Beall, Md.; Keating, N.Y.; Scott, Pa.; Prouty, Vt.

The three Democrats: Bible, Nev.; Lausche, Ohio; Johnston, S.C.

25 to 55 per cent anti-ADA

Four Republicans and 18 Democrats voted against ADA 25 to 55 per cent of the time. You can hardly consider them as anything more than "unsatisfactory" Senators.

The four Republicans: Case, N.J.; Javits, N.Y.; Langer, N.D.; Aiken, Vt.

The 18 Democrats: Hill, Ala.; Sparkman, Ala.; Bartlett, Alaska; Gruening, Alaska; Hayden, Ariz.; Fulbright, Ark.; Hartke, Ind.; Long, La.; Cannon, Nev.; Anderson, N.M.; Chavez, N.M.; Kerr, Okla.; Monroney, Okla.; Gore, Tenn.; Johnson, Texas; Byrd, W. Va.; Randolph, W. Va.; O'Mahoney, Wyo.

Zero to 25 per cent anti-ADA

Twenty-nine Democrats voted against ADA only 25 per cent of the time or less; no Republicans did so. Your designation for these Democrats probably will be the "Roll of Dishonor" Senators.

The 29 Democrats: Engle, Calif.; Carroll, Colo.; Dodd, Conn.; Church, Idaho; Douglas, Ill.; Muskie, Me.; Kennedy, Mass.; Hart, Mich.; McNamara, Mich.; Humphrey, Minn.; McCarthy, Minn.; Hennings, Mo.; Symington, Mo.; Mansfield, Mont.; Murray, Mont.; Williams, N.J.; Young, Ohio; Morse, Ore.; Neuberger, Ore.; Clark, Pa.; Green, R.I.; Pastore, R.I.; Kefauver, Tenn.; Yarborough, Texas; Moss, Utah; Jackson, Wash.; Magnuson, Wash.; Proxmire, Wisc.; McGee, Wyo.

Fifteen of the Democrats listed above voted 100 per cent pro-ADA. These were: Carroll, Douglas, Muskie, Kennedy, Hart, McNamara, Humphrey, McCarthy, Hennings, Symington, Morse, Neuberger, Clark, Magnuson, and Proxmire.

Six Democrats cast only one anti-ADA vote: Engle, Williams, Young, Green, Pastore, and Jackson. Two anti-ADA votes were cast by Senators Dodd, Kefauver and Moss, and three by Senators Church, Mansfield, Murray, Yarborough and McGee.

Among the ADA hundred per centers, note the names of three Presidential hopefuls—Humphrey, Kennedy and Symington. The last two are often labelled conservative or moderate because of their family connections, but both, long ago, gave up their independence for ADA support.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. — Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The House

Members of the House were also rated on nine roll call votes. One hundred and nine Republicans and 41 Democrats voted 70 to 100 per cent *against* ADA. At the other end of the political spectrum, 99 Congressmen, all Democrats, voted 100 per cent in accordance with ADA policies. Here are the listings:

Republicans—

70 per cent or more anti-ADA

Ariz.: Rhodes; **Calif.:** Younger, Gubser, Teague, McDonough, Jackson, Smith, Hiestand, Holt, Lipscomb, Utt, Wilson; **Colo.:** Chenoweth; **Fla.:** Cramer; **Idaho:** Budge; **Ill.:** Derwinski, Collier, Church, Hoffman, Mason, Allen, Arends, Michel, Chiperfield, Simpson, Springer; **Ind.:** Halleck, Adair; **Iowa:** Gross, Jensen, Hoeven; **Kans.:** Avery, Rees, Smith; **Ky.:** Siler; **Me.:** McIntire; **Mass.:** Bates, Keith; **Mich.:** Meader, Johansen, Hoffman, Ford, Chamberlain, Bentley, Cederberg, Knox; **Minn.:** Quie, Nelsen, Andersen, Langen; **Mo.:** Curtis; **Nebr.:** Weaver, Cunningham; **N.Y.:** Derounian, Becker, Bosch, Ray, Barry, St. George, Wharton, Taylor, Kilburn, Pirnie, Riehlman, Taber, Robison, Ostertag, Miller, Pillion; **N.C.:** Jonas; **N.D.:** Short; **Ohio:** Scherer, Hess, Schenck, McCulloch, Latta, Brown, Betts, Devine, Baumhart, Ayres, Henderson, Bow, Bolton, Minshall; **Okla.:** Belcher; **Pa.:** Milliken, Dague, Fenton, Lafore, Mumma, Bush, Simpson, Gavin, Kearns; **S.D.:** Berry; **Tenn.:** Reece; **Tex.:** Alger; **Utah:** Dixon; **Va.:** Poff, Broyhill; **Wash.:** Pelly, Westland, Mack, May; **Wisc.:** Van Pelt, Laird, Byrnes; **Wyo.:** Thomson.

Democrats—

70 per cent or more anti-ADA

Ark.: Gathings, Alford, Norrell; **Fla.:** Herlong, Haley; **Ga.:** Forrester, Flynt, Davis, Blitch, Landrum; **La.:** Willis, Brooks, Thompson, McSween; **Miss.:** Abernethy, Whitten, Williams, Winstead, Colmer; **Mo.:** Hull; **N.C.:** Barden, Scott, Lennon, Kitchin, Alexander, Hall; **S.C.:** Riley, Dorn, Ashmore; **Tenn.:** Murray; **Texas:** Dowdy, Kilgore, Burleson, Fisher, Casey; **Va.:** Downing, Gary, Abbitt, Tuck, Harrison, Smith.

100 per cent pro-ADA

The following members of the House, all Democrats, voted 100 per cent pro-ADA. Most of them are from big-city districts, and care little or nothing about what their constituents want because 75 per cent of big city voters don't even know who their Congressman is. Knowing this, many big city members have just one objective: to retain the favor of the labor bosses—who decide whether or not they stay in Congress.

Ariz.: Udall; **Calif.:** C. W. Miller, Johnson, Moss, Shelley, Cohelan, G. P. Miller, McFall, Sisk, King, Holifield, Kasem, Roosevelt, Saund; **Colo.:** Johnson; **Conn.:** Kowalski, Bowles; **Del.:** McDowell; **Ill.:** Dawson, O'Hara, Murphy, Kluczynski, O'Brien, Libonati, Rostenkowski, Yates, Pucinski, Boyle, Mack, Price; **Ind.:** Madden, Brademas; **Iowa:** Wolf, Carter, Smith, Coad; **Me.:** Oliver; **Md.:** Garmatz, Friedel; **Mich.:** Machrowitz, O'Hara, Diggs, Dingell, Griffiths; **Minn.:** Wier, Karth, Blatnik; **Mo.:** Karsten, Sullivan, Randall, Bolling, Brown, Carnahan; **Mont.:** Metcalf, Anderson; **N.J.:** Thompson, Rodino, Addonizio, Gallagher, Daniels; **N.Y.:** Holtzman, Delaney, Anfuso, Keogh, Kelly, Celler, Multer, Rooney, Powell, Santangelo, Farbstein, Teller, Zelenko, Healey, Dollinger, Buckley; **N.D.:** Burdick; **Ohio:** Levering, Hays, Vanik; **Ore.:** Ullman, Green, Porter; **Pa.:** Barrett, Granahan, Byrne, Nix, Green, Toll, Prokop, Rhodes, Quigley, Moorhead, Holland; **R.I.:** Forand; **S.D.:** McGovern; **Vt.:** Meyer; **Wisc.:** Flynn, Kastenmeier, Reuss.

The Younger Generation: Conservative

ALTHOUGH THE 1958 ELECTION was widely interpreted as a repudiation of conservatism, 1959 finds *more* young Congressmen on the "Roll of Honor" than appeared here last year. There are about as many Senate Young Conservatives now as there were last year (10 in 1959 as against 11 in 1958), while in the House, there are 80 Young Conservatives compared with last year's 70.

In Congress a "young" member is one 55 years of age or less. "Middle-aged" members are those between 55 and 65 years of age; the older ones are those above 65. In the Senate, there are ten "Honor Roll" conservatives in the young group. They are:

Republicans: Goldwater, Allott, Williams, Morton, Hruska, Curtis; Democrats: Frear, Smathers, Talmadge, Eastland.

In the House, there were 54 Republicans and 26 Democrats (all Southerners) among the young "Roll of Honor" conservatives.

The Republicans: Ariz: Rhodes; **Calif.:** Gubser, Teague, Jackson, Smith, Holt, Lipscomb, Wilson; **Fla.:** Cramer; **Idaho:** Budge; **Ill.:** Derwinski, Collier, Michel, Springer; **Ind.:** Adair; **Kans.:** Avery; **Me.:** McIntire; **Mass.:** Bates, Keith; **Mich.:** Meader, Johansen, Ford, Chamberlain, Bentley, Cederberg; **Minn.:** Quie, Nelsen, Langen; **Mo.:** Curtis; **Nebr.:** Weaver, Cunningham; **N.Y.:** Derounian, Bosch, Barry, Robison, Miller, Pillion; **N.C.:** Jonas; **Ohio:** Scherer, Latta, Betts, Devine, Baumhart, Ayres, Henderson, Minshall; **Pa.:** Lafore; **Tex.:**Alger; **Va.:** Poff, Broyhill; **Wash.:** Westland, May; **Wisc.:** Van Pelt, Laird, Byrnes; **Wyo.:** Thomson.

The Democrats: Ark.: Alford; **Fla.:** Herlong; **Ga.:** Flynt, Blitch, Landrum; **La.:** Willis, Thompson, McSween; **Miss.:** Whitten, Williams, Winstead; **Mo.:** Hull; **N.C.:** Scott, Lennon, Kitchin, Alexander, Hall; **S.C.:** Dorn, Ashmore; **Tex.:** Dowdy, Kilgore, Burleson, Casey; **Va.:** Downing, Abbitt, Harrison.

USE THIS HANDY ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS • 408 First Street, S.E. • Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "RATING YOUR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS" at $_____.

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 8-page article: single copy 25c (coins, not stamps); 5 copies $1; 15 copies $2; 100 copies $7.50; 500 copies $25; 1,000 copies $35. In 5,000 lots $30 per thousand. News section sold separately—at standard rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first class delivery add two cents a copy, for airmail, add four cents a copy.

Enter my subscription

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State _____

[] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

And a gift subscription for

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State _____

[] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Following are explanations of the thirteen roll calls on which ADA rated Members of the Senate:

The Senate

ADA rated the Senators on 13 roll calls, explained below. Individual ratings appear on the next page. The letter "p" next to a plus or minus sign means that the Senator was paired for or against the ADA position. The letter "a" means that, although absent, he was announced for or against the ADA. The capital letter "A" means that he was absent with no position announced. Names of Democrats appear in bold face type, Republicans in light face. The two Senators from Hawaii are not included as they did not vote on any of the roll calls. Both the explanations and the ratings are reproduced from the *ADA Voting Record* for October, 1959, by permission of Americans for Democratic Action.

1. Table Filibuster Rule Revision—Passed 60-36, January 9

Majority Leader Johnson succeeded in laying aside (tabling) Anderson motion to establish that Senate rules were not in effect until adopted anew by the Senate of a new Congress, so that the filibuster rule could be revised without itself being subject to filibuster. (A vote for tabling is marked minus; against, plus.)

2. Douglas Amendment to Rule 22—Defeated 28-67, January 12

The Senate rejected this move which would have made it possible to curb the effectiveness of the filibuster by permitting cloture (closing debate) by a majority vote after 15 days of debate. (A vote for the Douglas amendment is marked plus; against, minus.)

3. Increase Authorization For Urban Renewal—Defeated 33-56, February 5

The Senate turned down the Clark amendment to the first housing bill which was designed to increase the annual authorization for urban renewal from $350 million a year for 6 years to $450 million a year for 4 years (1959-62), and to permit an increase of $150 million in any year, within the total amount authorized. (A vote for the Clark amendment is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

4. Federal Aid for Economically Depressed Areas—Passed 49-46, March 23

Southern Democratic defections almost defeated the Area Redevelopment Act, providing $389.5 million in grants and loans for the redevelopment of rural and industrial areas suffering low income and chronic unemployment. The bill remains bogged in the House Rules Committee. (A vote for the bill is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

5. Extend Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958—Defeated 38-49, March 25

The Senate rejected this McNamara amendment which would have extended to July 1, 1960 all the provisions of the 1958 Act, furnishing Federal loans to the states to extend jobless benefits for a limited period. The Act lapsed on July 1, 1959. (A vote for the amendment is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

6. Regulate Union Meeting Procedures—Passed 47-46, April 22

Senator McClellan's amendment to secure "equal rights" to union members in speaking and voting at meetings, to prescribe procedures for raising dues and conducting disciplinary proceedings and to provide penalties was added to the Kennedy Labor Reform bill by a one-vote margin. A modified version of the amendment was included in the final legislation. (A vote for the amendment is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

7. Repeal Tax Credit on Dividend Income—Passed 47-31, June 25

The Senate adopted the McCarthy amendment to the excise tax extension act designed to close a loophole and raise additional revenue by repealing the preferential 4% tax credit allowed on dividend income. But the amendment was dropped in conference. (A vote for the amendment is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

8. Reduce Tax Benefits to Oil and Gas Interests—Defeated 21-54, June 25

The Senate rejected the Douglas proposal to reduce on a graduated scale the depletion allowance on oil and gas wells so that the present 27.5% allowance would have been available only for incomes of less than $1 million and the allowance for incomes exceeding $5 million would have been 15%. (A vote for the amendment is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

9. Table Motion Directed Against Borrowing From Treasury to Finance Economic Aid Program—Defeated 42-48, July 1

Contending that it violated Senate rules against appropriating in a legislative bill, Sen. Case (R., S.D.) lodged a point of order against a provision of the Mutual Security bill authorizing the Development Loan Fund, without further appropriation action, to borrow $5 billion from the Treasury over a five-year period for loans to under-developed countries. The point of order was overruled by the Chair, and Case appealed. Sen. Aiken's motion to table the appeal was defeated. Since sustension of the Case appeal would have endangered many other programs, the Democratic and GOP leadership compromised by reducing the DFL authorization and by requiring separate appropriation legislation; Case then withdrew his appeal. (A vote to table is marked plus; a vote against tabling, minus.)

10. Reduce Funds for Economic Development Loans Abroad—Defeated 30-50, July 2

The Johnson-Dirksen compromise (see vote 9) authorized the appropriation of $2 billion for 2 years for the Development Loan Fund. The Senate rejected this attempt by Sen. Ellender to cut the authorization still further by providing only $700 million for 1 year. But the *appropriation* bill finally approved carried only $550 million for the DLF. (A vote for the amendment is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

11. Prevent Repeal of Student Loyalty Oath—Passed 49-42, July 23

The Senate agreed to a motion by Sen. Long (D., La.) to recommit (turn down) a bill which would have deleted from the National Defense Education Act a requirement that students applying for Federal funds take loyalty oaths. (A vote for recommittal is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

12. Override First Housing Veto—Defeated 55-40 (⅔ required), August 12

The Senate failed in this attempt to pass the first housing bill over a presidential veto. The President had objected, among other things, to the size of urban renewal and public housing authorizations. After a second veto, a third scaled-down measure was enacted into law. (A vote to override is marked plus; a vote against overriding, minus.)

13. Eliminate Funds for College Classrooms—Defeated 40-53, August 17

The Senate rejected this effort by Sen. Robertson to eliminate from the second housing bill a $50 million college loan fund for construction of classroom and laboratory facilities. After a second veto, however, this provision was dropped. (A vote for the amendment is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here's How Your Senators Voted

These are ADA Ratings; to obtain conservative ratings, REVERSE the pluses and minuses.

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
ALABAMA													
HILL	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	−	−	+	+	+	+
SPARKMAN*	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	−	+	+	−	+	+
ALASKA													
BARTLETT*	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	−	+	+	+
GRUENING	−	−	+p	+	+	+	+p	−p	−	−	+	+	+
ARIZONA													
HAYDEN	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	−	−	+	−	+	+
Goldwater	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p	−	−	−
ARKANSAS													
McCLELLAN*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
FULBRIGHT	−	−	−	−p	−a	−	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
CALIFORNIA													
Kuchel	+	+	A	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	−	−
ENGLE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
COLORADO													
Allott*	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	+	−	−	−p
CARROLL	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
CONNECTICUT													
Bush	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p	+p	+	−	−
DODD	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	A	+	+
DELAWARE													
Williams	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−
FREAR*	−	−	−	−	−	A	+	−	−	−p	−	+	−
FLORIDA													
HOLLAND	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p	−p	−	+	−	−	−
SMATHERS	−	−	−	−	−a	−	A	−	−	−	−	+	+
GEORGIA													
RUSSELL*	−	−	−	−a	−a	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−
TALMADGE	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−
IDAHO													
Dworshak*	−	−	−	−	−	−	A	A	−	−	−	−	−
CHURCH	−p	−	+	+	−	+	+p	+p	+	+	+	+	+
ILLINOIS													
DOUGLAS*	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dirksen	−	−	−	−	−a	−	−	−	−	+	−	−p	−
INDIANA													
Capehart	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p	−p	+	+	−	−	+
HARTKE	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	−	−	+	+
IOWA													
Hickenlooper	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	A	+	−	−	−
Martin*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−a	−	−
KANSAS													
Schoeppel*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p	−	−	−
Carlson	−	−	−	−	−	−	A	−p	+	+a	−	−	−
KENTUCKY													
Cooper*	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	+	+	−	−
Morton	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−
LOUISIANA													
ELLENDER*	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	+
LONG	−	−	+	−	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	+
MAINE													
Smith*	+	−	−	+	+	−	−	+	−	+	−	−	−
MUSKIE	+	+	A	+	+	+	+a	+p	+	+	+	+	+
MARYLAND													
Butler	−	−	−	−	−a	−	−	−	−	−	−a	−	−
Beall	+	+	A	+	−	−	−	−	−	+a	−	−	−
MASSACHUSETTS													
Saltonstall*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	A	+	−	−
KENNEDY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+a	+	+	+
MICHIGAN													
McNAMARA*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+a	+p	+	+	+	+	+
HART	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MINNESOTA													
HUMPHREY*	+	+	+	+	+	+a	+a	+p	+	+	+	+	+
McCARTHY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+p	+	+	+
MISSISSIPPI													
EASTLAND*	−	−	−	−	−a	−	−	−	−	−p	−	−	−
STENNIS	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
MISSOURI													
HENNINGS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
SYMINGTON	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
MONTANA													
MURRAY*	−	−	+a	+	+	+	+a	−p	+p	+a	+a	+	+
MANSFIELD	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
NEBRASKA													
HRUSKA	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Curtis*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
NEVADA													
BIBLE	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	+
CANNON	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	−	+	−	−	+	+
NEW HAMPSHIRE													
Bridges*	−	−a	−p	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Cotton	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
NEW JERSEY													
Case*	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	+	+	−	−
WILLIAMS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
NEW MEXICO													
CHAVEZ	−	−	−	+	+	−	+a	−p	−p	A	A	+	+
ANDERSON*	+	−	−p	+	−	+	+	−	+	A	+	+	−
NEW YORK													
Javits	+	+	+	−	−	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	−
Keating	+	+	−	−	−	+	A	−	+	+	−	−	−
NORTH CAROLINA													
ERVIN	−	−	−	−	−a	−	+	+	−	−	−	+	−
JORDAN*	−	−	−	−	−a	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	A
NORTH DAKOTA													
Langer (deceased)	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	+	−	−	−	+p	+
Young	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
OHIO													
LAUSCHE	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	−	+	−	−	−
YOUNG	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+
OKLAHOMA													
KERR*	−	−	−	+	−	+	+	−	+	−	−	+	+
MONRONEY	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	+	+	+	+
OREGON													
MORSE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+a	+p	+	+	+	+	+
NEUBERGER*	+p	+p	+p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PENNSYLVANIA													
CLARK	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Scott	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	+	−
RHODE ISLAND													
GREEN*	−	+	+	+	+	+a	+a	+p	+p	+a	+	+	+
PASTORE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+
SOUTH CAROLINA													
JOHNSTON	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	+
THURMOND*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
SOUTH DAKOTA													
Mundt*	−	−p	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	+
Case	−	−	−	−	−	−	A	A	−	+	A	−	A
TENNESSEE													
KEFAUVER*	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
GORE	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	A	+	+	+	+
TEXAS													
JOHNSON*	−	−	−	+	A	+	+	−	+	+	−	+	+
YARBOROUGH	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
UTAH													
Bennett	−	−	−	−	−a	−	−	−	−a	+p	−	−	−
MOSS	+	+	−	+	−	+	+	A	+	+	+	+	+
VERMONT													
Aiken	+	+	−	−	A	−	A	+p	+	+	+	−	−
Prouty	+	−	−	−	−	−	A	+p	+	+a	−	−	−
VIRGINIA													
BYRD	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
ROBERTSON*	−	−	−	−	−	−p	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
WASHINGTON													
MAGNUSON	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
JACKSON	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
WEST VIRGINIA													
RANDOLPH*	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	−	+	+
BYRD	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	+
WISCONSIN													
Wiley	+	+	−	−	−	−	A	A	−	+	−	−	−
PROXMIRE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
WYOMING													
O'MAHONEY*	−	−	+a	+	+	+	+a	−p	A	A	A	+p	+a
McGEE	−	−	+	+	+	+	+a	−p	+	+	+	+	+

*Election for this seat in 1960

ARTICLE 4

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 48 HUMAN EVENTS December 2, 1959

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS

Article Section II

The House

Nine key votes were chosen by ADA to determine the "liberalism" of members of the House. Individual ratings, based on these votes, begin on the following page. In these ratings, the letter "p" next to a plus or minus sign means that the Congressman was paired for or against the ADA position. The letter "a" means that, although absent, he was announced for or against the ADA. The capital letter "A" means that he was absent with no position announced, and the combination "P*" means the Congressman, though present, did not vote on the issue. Names of Democrats appear in bold face type; Republicans in light face. The Representative from Hawaii is not included as he did not vote on any of the issues. The number next to each Representative's name is the number of his district. Both the explanations and the ratings are reproduced from *ADA Voting Record* for October, 1959, by permission of Americans for Democratic Action.

Following are explanations of the nine roll calls on which ADA rated Members of the House:

1. Admit Hawaii to the Union—Passed 323-89, March 12

The House voted by a commanding margin to grant statehood to Hawaii. (A vote for passage is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

2. Restrict Authority of TVA To Issue Bonds—Defeated 182-231, May 7

The House rejected the move by Rep. Scherer (R., Ohio) to recommit (turn down) a bill authorizing the Tennessee Valley authority to sell revenue bonds to finance expansion and improvement of facilities. The Scherer motion would have added language providing for Budget Bureau control over TVA projects. (A vote for recommittal is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

3. Bar Direct Treasury Financing for Public Housing, Urban Renewal—Passed 222-201, May 21

The House accepted this amendment to the first housing bill offered by Rep. Thomas (D., Tex.). Amendment made funds available for urban renewal and public housing programs only after approval by Appropriations Committee instead of through authorization bill and public debt transaction with Treasury. The amendment was dropped in conference. (A vote for the amendment is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

4. Strike Public Housing Authorization, Cut Urban Renewal—Defeated 189-234, May 21

The House rejected this move to reject the first housing bill in favor of a substitute offered by Rep. Herlong (D., Fla.). The Herlong bill would have eliminated authority to build new public housing units and cut the urban renewal authorization drastically. (A vote for recommittal is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

5. Foreign Aid Program—Passed 271-142, June 18

The House approved this $3.5 billion mutual security bill, including a $700 million authorization for the Development Loan Fund. But substantial cuts in funds were made later in the appropriation bill. (A vote for the bill is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

6. Reject "States Rights" Anti-Preemption Bill—Defeated 191-227, June 24

The House rejected this motion by Rep. Lindsay (R., N.Y.) to recommit (turn down) a bill permitting states to legislate in any area of concurrent jurisdiction not specifically preempted by Congress, and to resurrect state anti-subversive laws. (A vote for recommittal is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

7. Reject Move to Upset Supreme Court Mallory Decision—Defeated 138-261, July 7

The House turned down this Lindsay motion to recommit (turn down) a bill making a confession admissable in the Federal Courts even though it was obtained from a defendant while he was being detained for an unreasonable time before arraignment. (A vote for recommittal is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

8. Substitute Tough Labor Bill for Reform Measure—Passed 229-201, August 13

The House accepted this bill sponsored by Reps. Landrum (D., Ga.) and Griffin (R., Mich.) which, by curbing picketing and boycotts, impairs union bargaining powers in dealing with management. The Landrum-Griffiin bill was voted in preference to a measure limited to internal union reform. (A vote for the substitute is marked minus; a vote against, plus.)

9. Establish Food Stamp Program—Passed 232-127, August 21

The House adopted the Sullivan amendment to an overseas food surplus disposal program, permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute surplus food to needy persons in the U.S. through a food stamp system. (A vote for the amendment is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

Many Congressmen next year will be trying to ride with the growing conservative tide by masquerading as "conservatives"—but their votes on key roll calls, such as those listed here, may say otherwise. They can get away with this double-talk because parliamentary rules often necessitate several votes on an issue. This procedure gives a Congressman a chance to vote on both sides of an issue, and enables him to point to one vote when writing to conservative constituents at the same time that he is satisfying the labor bosses by voting their way on the real test vote. A case in point is the Landrum-Griffin labor bill—vote No. 8 on the ADA House score sheet. This key vote, in which the Landrum-Griffin Bill was substituted for the mild bill desired by the labor bosses and the ADA by a close vote of 229-201, is the one by which the labor bosses judge a Representative. If he voted their way on it, they are willing to forgive a vote for the bill on "final passage"—if the Congressman deems such a vote necessary in a marginal district where he must get some conservative votes. The labor bill key vote was followed by final passage, approved 303-125, and the passage of the Senate-House conference bill by 352-52. The increasingly wider margins show that many Congressmen, having done their best for the labor bosses on the key vote, then voted for the bill on "final passage" to throw a sop to their conservative constituents.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. — Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House Voting Record

These are ADA Ratings; to obtain conservative ratings, REVERSE the pluses and minuses.

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ALABAMA									
1. BOYKIN	+	+	+	+	A	–	–	–	A
2. GRANT	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
3. ANDREWS	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	+
4. ROBERTS	–	+	+p	+p	+	–	–	–	+
5. RAINS	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	+
6. SELDEN	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
7. ELLIOTT	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	A	A
8. JONES	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	+
9. HUDDLESTON	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+
ALASKA									
AL RIVERS	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
ARIZONA									
1. Rhodes	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
2. UDALL	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
ARKANSAS									
1. GATHINGS	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
2. MILLS	–	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	+
3. TRIMBLE	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	+
4. HARRIS	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	+
5. ALFORD	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	A
6. NORRELL	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
CALIFORNIA									
1. MILLER, C. W.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. JOHNSON	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. MOSS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. Mailliard	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–
5. SHELLEY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. Baldwin	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
7. COHELAN	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+	+
8. MILLER, G. P.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9. Younger	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
10. Gubser	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
11. McFALL	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. SISK	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
13. Teague	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–p
14. HAGEN	+	+	+	+	A	+	–	+	–
15. McDonough	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
16. Jackson	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	A
17. KING	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
18. Hosmer	+	–p	–	–	+	+	–	–	–
19. HOLIFIELD	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
20. Smith	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
21. Hiestand	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
22. Holt	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
23. DOYLE	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
24. Lipscomb	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
25. KASEM	+	+	+	+	A	+	A	+	+
26. ROOSEVELT	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
27. SHEPPARD	+	+	+p	+	+	–	–	+	+
28. Utt	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
29. SAUND	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
30. Wilson	+	–	–	–	+p	–	–	–	–
COLORADO									
1. ROGERS	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	+
2. JOHNSON	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
3. Chenoweth	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
4. ASPINALL	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
CONNECTICUT									
AL KOWALSKI	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1. DADDARIO	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. BOWLES	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
3. GIAIMO	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. IRWIN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
5. MONAGAN	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
DELAWARE									
AL McDOWELL	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	+	+
FLORIDA									
1. Cramer	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
2. BENNETT	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
3. SIKES	–	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	+
4. FASCELL	+	+	+	–	+	–	–	–	–
5. HERLONG	+	–	–	–	+p	–	–	–	–
6. ROGERS	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	+
7. HALEY	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
8. MATTHEWS	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
GEORGIA									
1. PRESTON	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–p
2. PILCHER	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–p
3. FORRESTER	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4. FLYNT	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
5. DAVIS	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
6. VINSON	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
7. MITCHELL	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	+
8. BLITCH	–	+	–	–	–p	–	–	–	+
9. LANDRUM	–p	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10. BROWN	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
IDAHO									
1. PFOST	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+
2. Budge	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
ILLINOIS									
1. DAWSON	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A
2. O'HARA	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. MURPHY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. Derwinski	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5. KLUCZYNSKI	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. O'BRIEN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7. LIBONATI	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8. ROSTENKOWSKI	+	+	+	+	A	+	+	+	A
9. YATES	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
10. Collier	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+p
11. PUCINSKI	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. BOYLE (deceased)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
13. Church	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
14. Hoffman	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15. Mason	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	A
16. Allen	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
17. Arends	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
18. Michel	+	–	–	–	–p	–	–	–	–
19. Chiperfield	+	–	–	–	+	–p	–	–	–
20. Simpson	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
21. MACK	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+	+
22. Springer	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
23. SHIPLEY	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	A
24. PRICE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
25. GRAY	+	–	+	+	–	+	+	+	+
INDIANA									
1. MADDEN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. Halleck	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	A
3. BRADEMAS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. Adair	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
5. ROUSH	+	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	+
6. WAMPLER	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+p
7. Bray	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	+
8. DENTON	A	+	–	+	–	+	+	+	+
9. HOGAN	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+
10. HARMON	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	+
11. BARR	+	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	+
IOWA									
1. Schwengel	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	–
2. WOLF	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. Gross	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4. CARTER (deceased)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. SMITH	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. COAD	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7. Jensen	+	–	–	–	–	–	A	–	–
8. Hoeven	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
KANSAS									
1. Avery	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
2. GEORGE	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
3. HARGIS	A	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	+
4. Rees	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5. BREEDING	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+
6. Smith	–	–	–	–	–	–	A	–	–
KENTUCKY									
1. STUBBLEFIELD	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	+
2. NATCHER	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	+	+
3. BURKE	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+p
4. CHELF	+	+	–	+	–	–	A	+	+
5. SPENCE	+	+	+	+	+	–p	–	+	+
6. WATTS	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	+	+
7. PERKINS	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
8. Siler	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
LOUISIANA									
1. HEBERT	+	+	–	–	+p	–	–	–	+
2. BOGGS	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	+
3. WILLIS	–p	+p	–	–	A	–	–	–	+
4. BROOKS	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p	–	+

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are ADA Ratings; to obtain conservative ratings, REVERSE the pluses and minuses.

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
LOUISIANA (cont.)									
5. PASSMAN	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+p
6. MORRISON	+p	+	A	A	A	–	–p	+	+p
7. THOMPSON	–p	+	–	–	–	–	–p	–	+p
8. McSWEEN	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
MAINE									
1. OLIVER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. COFFIN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	–
3. McIntire	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MARYLAND									
1. JOHNSON	+	A	–	+	+	–	–	–	+
2. BREWSTER	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+
3. GARMATZ	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. FALLON	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+
5. LANKFORD	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+
6. FOLEY	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
7. FRIEDEL	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MASSACHUSETTS									
1. Conte	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	+
2. BOLAND	+	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. PHILBIN	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. DONOHUE	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. Rogers	+	+	–	+	+	–	A	A	+
6. Bates	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
7. LANE	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
8. McDONALD	+	–	+	+	A	+	+p	+	+
9. Keith	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
10. Curtis	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–
11. O'NEILL	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. McCORMACK	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
13. BURKE	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
14. Martin	+p	–	–	–	+	A	–	–	A
MICHIGAN									
1. MACHROWICZ	+	P*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. Meader	+	–p	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
3. Johansen	–	–p	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4. Hoffman	–	–	–	–	–	–	A	–	–
5. Ford	+p	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
6. Chamberlain	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
7. O'HARA	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8. Bentley	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+p
9. Griffin	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
10. Cederberg	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
11. Knox	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+p
12. Bennett	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	+
13. DIGGS	+	A	+	+	+	+	+p	A	+
14. RABAUT	+	+	–	+	+p	+p	+p	+	+
15. DINGELL	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
16. LESINSKI	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
17. GRIFFITHS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
18. Broomfield	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
MINNESOTA									
1. Quie	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
2. Nelsen	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
3. WIER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. KARTH	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. Judd	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
6. MARSHALL	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
7. Andersen	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
8. BLATNIK	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9. Langen	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
MISSISSIPPI									
1. ABERNETHY	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	A
2. WHITTEN	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
3. SMITH	–	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	+
4. WILLIAMS	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
5. WINSTEAD	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–p
6. COLMER	–	+p	–	–	–	–	–	–	A
MISSOURI									
1. KARSTEN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. Curtis	A	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	–
3. SULLIVAN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. RANDALL (Sworn in 3/9/59	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. BOLLING	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. HULL	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
7. BROWN	+	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+
8. CARNAHAN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9. CANNON	A	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	A
10. JONES	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+
11. MOULDER	+	+	A	+p	–	–	–p	+	+
MONTANA									
1. METCALF	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MONTANA (cont.)									
2. ANDERSON	+	A	+	+	+	+p	A	+	+
NEBRASKA									
1. Weaver	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2. Cunningham	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
3. BROCK	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
4. McGINLEY	+	A	–	–	–	–	–	+	+
NEVADA									
AL BARING	+	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	+
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
1. Merrow	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	A
2. Bass	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–
NEW JERSEY									
1. Cahill	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	–
2. Glenn	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–
3. Auchincloss	+	–	–	–	+	+	–p	–	–
4. THOMPSON	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. Frelinghuysen	A	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–
6. Dwyer	+	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	+
7. Widnall	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–
8. Canfield	+	–	+	+	A	A	A	A	A
9. Osmers	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	+	–p
10. RODINO	+	+p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11. ADDONIZIO	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. Wallhauser	+	–	–	+	+	+p	–	–	–
13. GALLAGHER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
14. DANIELS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
NEW MEXICO									
AL MONTOYA	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
AL MORRIS	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	+
NEW YORK									
1. Wainwright	+	–	–	–	+	+p	+	–	–p
2. Derounian	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
3. Becker	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–p
4. Halpern	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+
5. Bosch	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
6. HOLTZMAN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7. DELANEY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8. ANFUSO	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
9. KEOGH	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
10. KELLY	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11. CELLER	+p	+p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. Dorn	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+
13. MULTER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
14. ROONEY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
15. Ray	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–
16. POWELL	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+p
17. Lindsay	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	–
18. SANTANGELO	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
19. FARBSTEIN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
20. TELLER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
21. ZELENKO	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
22. HEALEY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
23. DOLLINGER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
24. BUCKLEY	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+
25. Fino	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
26. Dooley	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	A
27. Barry	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
28. St. George	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
29. Wharton	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	A
30. O'BRIEN	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
31. Taylor	A	–	–	–	+	–	A	–	–p
32. STRATTON	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	+	+
33. Kilburn	–	–	–	–	+	–p	A	–	–p
34. Pirnie	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
35. Riehlman	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
36. Taber	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–p
37. Robison	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
38. Weis	+	–	–	–	+	+	A	–	–
39. Ostertag	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
40. Miller	+	–	–	–	+	–p	–p	–	A
41. DULSKI	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
42. Pillion	–	–p	–	–	+	–	–	–	A
43. Goodell (Sworn in 7/2/59)					+	–p	+	–	–
NORTH CAROLINA									
1. BONNER	–	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	+
2. FOUNTAIN	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
3. BARDEN	–	A	–	–	–p	–	–	–	–
4. COOLEY	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+
5. SCOTT	+	–	–p	–p	–	–	–	–	+
6. DURHAM	+	+	+	+	A	–	–	–	+
7. LENNON	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
8. KITCHIN	–	+p	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
9. ALEXANDER	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are ADA Ratings; to obtain conservative ratings, REVERSE the pluses and minuses.

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
NORTH CAROLINA (cont.)									
10. Jonas	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
11. **WHITENER**	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
12. **HALL**	A	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	A
NORTH DAKOTA									
AL BURDICK	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+
AL Short	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
OHIO									
1. Scherer	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
2. Hess	−	−p	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
3. Schenck	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
4. McCulloch	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
5. Latta	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
6. **VACANCY**									
7. Brown	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
8. Betts	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
9. **ASHLEY**	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
10. **MOELLER**	+	+	+	+	−	+	−p	+	+
11. **COOK**	+	+	−	+	+	+p	+	+	+
12. Devine	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
13. Baumhart	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
14. Ayres	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
15. Henderson	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
16. Bow	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p
17. **LEVERING**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
18. **HAYS**	+	+	A	A	+	+	+	+	A
19. **KIRWAN**	+	+p	−	+	+	−	+	+	+
20. **FEIGHAN**	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
21. **VANIK**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
22. Bolton	A	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−p
23. Minshall	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p
OKLAHOMA									
1. Belcher	+	−	−	−	−p	−	−	−	−
2. **EDMONDSON**	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
3. **ALBERT**	+	+	+	+	+	−p	−	+	+
4. **STEED**	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	+	+p
5. **JARMAN**	+	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	+
6. **MORRIS**	+	+	+	+	−	+	−	+	+
OREGON									
1. Norblad	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	+
2. **ULLMAN**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. **GREEN**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. **PORTER**	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+
PENNSYLVANIA									
1. **BARRETT**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. **GRANAHAN**	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+	+
3. **BYRNE**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. **NIX**	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5. **GREEN**	+p	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. **TOLL**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7. Milliken	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
8. Curtin	+	−	−p	−p	+	+	−	−	−
9. Dague	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	A
10. **PROKOP**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11. **FLOOD**	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
12. Fenton	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
13. Lafore	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
14. **RHODES**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
15. **WALTER**	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
16. Mumma	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
17. Bush (deceased)	+	−p	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
18. Simpson	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−p
19. **QUIGLEY**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
20. Van Zandt	+	−	−	+	+	+	−	+	+
21. **DENT**	+	−	+	+	−	+	+	+	+
22. Saylor	+	−	−	+	−	+	+	+	+
23. Gavin	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
24. Kearns	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
25. **CLARK**	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
26. **MORGAN**	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p
27. Fulton	+	−	−	+	+	+	−	+	+
28. **MOORHEAD**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
29. Corbett	+	−	−	+	+	+	−p	+	+
30. **HOLLAND**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
RHODE ISLAND									
1. **FORAND**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+p	+	+
2. **FOGARTY**	+	−	+p	+p	+	+	+	+	+p
SOUTH CAROLINA									
1. **RIVERS**	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	−	A
2. **RILEY**	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
3. **DORN**	−	+	−	−	−p	−	−	−	−
4. **ASHMORE**	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
5. **HEMPHILL**	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
6. **McMILLAN**	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+

Issue No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
SOUTH DAKOTA									
1. **McGOVERN**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. Berry	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
TENNESSEE									
1. Reece	+	+	−	−	−	−	A	−	−
2. Baker	+	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	+
3. **FRAZIER**	−	+	+	+	+	−	A	−	+
4. **EVINS**	+	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	+p
5. **LOSER**	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+
6. **BASS**	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+	+
7. **MURRAY**	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
8. **EVERETT**	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	−	−
9. **DAVIS**	+	+	+	+	+	−p	−	−	A
TEXAS									
1. **PATMAN**	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	+	+
2. **BROOKS**	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
3. **BECKWORTH**	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+
4. **RAYBURN**									
5. Alger	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−p
6. **TEAGUE**	+	A	+	+	−	−	−	−	+
7. **DOWDY**	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
8. **THOMAS**	−	+	−	+	−	−	A	+	+
9. **THOMPSON**	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+	+
10. **THORNBERRY**	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+
11. **POAGE**	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	+
12. **WRIGHT**	+	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	+
13. **IKARD**	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+
14. **YOUNG**	−	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	+
15. **KILGORE**	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−
16. **RUTHERFORD**	−	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	+
17. **BURLESON**	−	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−
18. **ROGERS**	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	+
19. **MAHON**	−	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	+
20. **KILDAY**	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	A
21. **FISHER**	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	A
22. **CASEY**	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	+
UTAH									
1. Dixon	A	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
2. **KING**	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	−
VERMONT									
AL MEYER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
VIRGINIA									
1. **DOWNING**	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
2. **HARDY**	−	−	+	+	+	−	−	−	+
3. **GARY**	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
4. **ABBITT**	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
5. **TUCK**	−p	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
6. Poff	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
7. **HARRISON**	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
8. **SMITH**	−p	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
9. **JENNINGS**	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	+	+
10. Broyhill	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
WASHINGTON									
1. Pelly	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
2. Westland	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
3. Mack	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
4. May	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
5. Horan	+	+	−	−	+	−	A	−	A
6. Tollefson	+	A	−	+	+	+	−	+	−
7. **MAGNUSON**	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	A
WEST VIRGINIA									
1. Moore	−	−	−	+	−	+	−	+	+
2. **STAGGERS**	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. **BAILEY**	+	−	+	+	−	+	A	+	+
4. **HECHLER**	+	−	+	+	+	+	A	+	+
5. **KEE**	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
6. **SLACK**	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
WISCONSIN									
1. **FLYNN**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. **KASTENMEIER**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. Withrow	+	−	−	−p	−p	−	A	+	+
4. **ZABLOCKI**	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
5. **REUSS**	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. Van Pelt	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	A
7. Laird	A	−	−p	−p	−	−	−	−	−
8. Byrnes	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
9. **JOHNSON**	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+
10. O'Konski	+	−	A	A	−	+	−	+	+
WYOMING									
AL Thomson	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 48 HUMAN EVENTS December 2, 1959

Article Section III

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

How I Lost the Nomination

By THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

(An accurate copy of a memorandum, written by Taft late in 1952, *and until now circulated privately among his close friends)*

HUMAN EVENTS publishes this document because in it Senator Taft emphasizes that two underlying causes brought about the defeat of his effort for the 1952 *Presidential nomination and that tactical defeats at the convention were secondary. These causes were:* (1) THE POWER OF THE NEW YORK FINANCIAL INTEREST AND OTHER BUSINESS ELEMENTS INFLUENCED BY THIS INTEREST; (2) THE "PROPAGANDA" OPPOSITION OF ABOUT FOUR-FIFTHS OF THE NATION'S PRESS. *In the latter case, this opposition included nearly all New Deal Democratic newspapers, columnists and broadcasters, some of whom later supported Adlai Stevenson, after Taft was defeated for the nomination.*

It is important that this document be studied for its application to any situation—present or future—arising from the race between Nixon and Rockefeller for the 1960 *Republican nomination.*

I AM WRITING this brief analysis of the result of the 1952 Republican Convention and the several reasons for that result. There is a tendency to lay too much stress on particular circumstances at the convention and exaggerate the importance of events which made headlines at the moment. I don't want to have any of my supporters blamed for the result and charged with the mistakes which they did not make or which did not really affect the result. I don't want my supporters to feel that there were any serious mistakes of omission and that some striking move would have solved the whole problem.

The result of the convention came far more from the underlying causes which had operated steadily for eight months, and continued to operate at Chicago. First, it was the power of the New York financial interest and a large number of business men subject to New York influence, who had selected General Eisenhower as their candidate at least a year ago. There was a strong and substantial minority of Taft supporters among business leaders, but they were a minority, particularly in the East.

Second, four-fifths of the influential newspapers in the country were opposed to me continuously and vociferously and many turned themselves into propaganda sheets for my opponent. Of course, this was not true of the McCormick papers [the Chicago Tribune, *the* New York Daily News *and the* Washington Times Herald], *the* Wall Street Journal, *the* Omaha World Herald *and the* Los Angeles Times. *The* Philadelphia Inquirer, *the Hearst papers and the Knight papers remained neutral. But most other Republican papers were almost campaign sheets for Eisenhower and were supplemented by the violent support of every New Deal and so-called independent paper. Like the editors, the majority of Republican Governors were sold on Eisenhower support, although a majority of Senators and Congressmen were in my favor. However, the Governors had far more political influence on delegates.*

These underlying causes operated throughout the campaign and at the convention.

The convention result, after all, depended far more on the number of delegates than it did on changes of opinion at the convention, which at so many conventions are likely finally to result in a nomination. A long and intense campaign almost entirely between the supporters of General Eisenhower and myself had lined up nearly all the delegates on one side or the other, except those pledged to Warren, Stassen and McKeldin [Earl Warren, Harold Stassen and Theodore McKeldin]. It was a two-man fight.

Going back through the campaign, the primary results were generally favorable to that candidate who had the support of the organization and the newspapers. The primary results were favorable to Eisenhower in the East—in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New Jersey; and this had a substantial effect on all New England, New York and Delaware delegates. The primary results were favorable to Taft west of the Alleghenies in West Virginia, Illinois, Wisconsin and Nebraska. This had a substantial effect, of course, on Indiana, Kentucky and many other Western states. Where there were no primaries, the convention results for Eisenhower in Washington, Colorado and Iowa were more than matched by Taft conventions in many other Western states. The Oregon primary helped Eisenhower on the Pacific Coast.

THE INFLUENCES OPERATING, which I have described above, were such that I had to have a pretty clear majority in order to hold a lot of marginal delegates. We probably would have done better if we had put on a real primary campaign in Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, Oregon and some other states. The difficulty was the tremendous expense involved in any such program and the lack of time to make an adequate campaign against the newspaper influences. Even in South Dakota we almost lost because the three leading newspapers were for Eisenhower.

The net result, after the primaries were over, provided an estimate of 604 delegates for Taft and about 400 for Eisenhower, with 128 for other candidates and 86 uncommitted, largely in Pennsylvania and New York. But this was never a firm estimate, and we knew that even though this number of delegates had expressed a preference for me they might be persuaded otherwise. In this estimate of 604, we counted on twenty-seven delegates from Michigan who favored me at the time of the Michigan convention and afterwards, seventeen from New York, nine from New Jersey, twenty-eight from Texas, ten from Louisiana. I saw this number of delegates in New York and New Jersey personally and had definite statements that they would vote for me. We did not count on Fine's delegates [Governor of Pennsylvania]. It was always clear, therefore, that while we had a hard core of 500 delegates, there were others who were subject to persuasion and pressure. The Michigan estimate was particularly uncertain as long as [Arthur E.] Summerfield tried to hold Michigan as a unit.

To match up possible losses from these delegates, we worked on Governor Fine, Governor McKeldin and numerous uncommitted delegates in New York, New Jersey and other states. We also had assurances of twenty-five from California if Warren ever released them. In spite of every reasonable effort, we did not persuade McKeldin, Fine or Summerfield. Because of strong pressure by the Governors of New York and New Jersey [Dewey and Driscoll] we lost most of the delegates who had given assurances of support in those states. We did hold nine votes out of fifteen favorable Taft supporters after McKeldin accepted an invitation to nominate Eisenhower. The number of California delegates on the Georgia contest was only eight instead of twenty-five because of pressure from the Governor [Warren] and Senators [then William F. Knowland and Richard M. Nixon] from California.

By the time the convention opened, we reduced our estimates in Michigan by nine discounting Summerfield's defection, Delaware by three, Oklahoma two, Virginia two and Texas by six by reason of the compromise I proposed. These losses were made up by sixteen additional contest delegates and gains in Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts and a few other states, but our estimate of 607 was again based on New York, New Jersey and Michigan delegates,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as including fifty from the contested states of Georgia, Louisiana and Texas. It was clear, therefore, when the convention began that if Warren, Stassen and Eisenhower all ganged up on us on preliminary votes, we might not be able to win unless we held on to every vote, or replaced them with additional votes. Neither of these results were we able to achieve.

The first question arose on the change in the rules contrary to every principle of parliamentary procedure. The whole strategy of the other side was to change the rules and get enough votes to steal all the contested delegates, and it was difficult to see how this could be prevented if the Eisenhower people were supported by the Warren and Stassen forces. They did obtain their support because apparently the Warren and Stassen forces felt that their own success depended on a deadlock, and that this action might bring about a deadlock.

It probably would have been better to agree to the rule, but, of course, the loss of votes would make the contest fight more difficult. It was probably a mistake to take a vote because it showed that the combined forces against us controlled the convention, but even a concession on our part would also have been regarded as a sign of weakness. On the rule vote we held practically all the Taft states, but were unable to withstand the Summerfield pressure in Michigan, the Dewey pressure in New York and the Fine pressure in Pennsylvania. Fine forced his own representative on the Credentials Committee to reverse the stand he had taken after hearing the evidence.

THE KEY VOTE came on the Georgia contest, where we lost the equivalent of seventeen votes because of the new rule, but we picked up nine Taft votes in Maryland and eight in California in spite of strong pressure from McKeldin and the Governor and Senators from California. On the other hand, we fell below our estimates in New York, where all but four delegates finally voted against us, and we lost from our estimates four in Michigan, three in New Jersey, three in Nebraska and single votes in other states. We were thirty-eight votes short of winning the Georgia contest, and apparently the same vote would have prevailed in the contest on Texas. Some of this defection may have resulted from the loss of morale on the rules vote, but it seems unlikely. Some Taft delegates couldn't or wouldn't recognize that the Georgia vote was really the first vote on the nomination. Every Eisenhower delegate knew what his job was, and pressure was strong in the states where we had to gain votes.

After the Eisenhower forces, with the assistance of Warren and Stassen, took thirty-nine votes away from us and gave them to Eisenhower, in addition to eleven Louisiana votes lost in the credentials committee, our prospective strength on the first ballot fell well below his strength, and he had all the bandwagon advantage which we would otherwise have had. It is hard to see how we could have won the Georgia contest unless we converted Fine or Summerfield or McKeldin, or held our full strength in New York and New Jersey.

I have referred to the underlying forces which operated not only during the campaign but at the convention. The truth is that we were up against a tremendous publicity blitz led by four-fifths of the newspapers of the country, and all the magazines. Most of the Governors also lent themselves to this propaganda and in states where we did not have a majority we had difficulty in getting any votes at all because of the pressure of the Governors. It is remarkable that as many as 500 *delegates stood firm against this tremendous pressure, even after the bandwagon was rolling.*

The control of the press enabled the Eisenhower people to do many things which otherwise could not have been done. The making of a moral issue out of the Texas case was only possible because every internationalist paper sent special writers to blow up a contest which ordinarily would have excited a few days' interest and would have been settled fairly by the National Committee and the Credentials Committee. If there was a moral issue, my suggestion that I be allotted only the district delegates clearly not contested, and that representatives of both sides discuss the whole matter in detail, district by district, certainly should have destroyed that issue. But the press was completely unfair in their treatment of it. Adverse national committeemen frankly admitted that they could not even sit down and talk about the merits of the various Taft contests because it would deprive them of the smear issue. Zweifel [Henry Zweifel, then the Republican National Committeeman from Texas, headed the Taft forces from that state.] people had a sound moral claim that the Democrats had taken over Republican primaries. The only way we could get it before the public at all was by advertisements.

In the same way the Eisenhower press made a moral issue of the change in rules, although it was contrary to all parliamentary procedure, and was admittedly proposed only for this convention because of the danger of making it a permanent rule.

Also the Eisenhower press, although usually adverse to the growth of television, played up the exclusion of television from the National Committee as though it involved an intention to steal delegates in secret although the proceedings were public and all the American press were present to watch what happened.

It is all very well to say that we should not have permitted these issues to be created, but the alternative was surrender on matters in which we were in the right, and if there had not been these issues the publicity firms would have invented others to be shouted by the pro-Eisenhower press.

A study of the primaries will also show that the metropolitan newspapers had a tremendous effect on the results in the primaries and conventions, far more than they do on general elections. Eisenhower victories were always ballyhooed and Taft victories played down.

My conclusion, therefore, is that we had practically to secure a very substantial majority of the total number of delegates to win, and that the net result of the primaries was to give us a very thin majority if any.

At one point in the convention it was suggested that I retire and turn over my delegates to General MacArthur or some other candidate. Any such move, of course, was impossible before the first ballot. It would have been a surrender of principle and a betrayal of thousands of workers and millions of voters who supported me during the eight-months campaign. Furthermore, these delegates were built up as Taft delegates, and I had no power to transfer any of them to anybody. It would, of course, have been an indication of weakness and probably would have resulted in the nomination of Eisenhower almost by acclamation. There was no evidence that anyone else had any substantial support in addition to that which I had.

Of course, if a deadlock had been created after the first ballot, I would have been glad to reconsider the whole situation and would have been glad to withdraw in favor of some other candidate holding my general views, if it had been clear that I could not be nominated and that he would have been stronger on the second ballot than I. There was a tentative agreement on the part of the Warren and Stassen forces to recess the convention after the first ballot.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS

408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D, C,

Send me _____ reprints of "HOW I LOST THE NOMINATION" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ¼c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription

☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State_____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED